<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 97-99, 103-109, 112-113 and 116-121 are amended; claims 1-96, 100-102, 110-111 and 114 have been canceled; claims 122-128 are added. After entry of these amendments, claims 97-99, 103-109, 112-113 and 115-128 will be pending.

<u>REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)</u>

Claims 72-121 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bailey (U.S. Patent 6,785,671) in view of Venkatraman (WO/0113273) and further in view of Williams (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0032612). Claims 1-96, 100-102, 110-111 and 114 have been canceled. Applicants do not concede, however, that the rejection of these claims under § 103(a) was appropriate.

Claim 97, as amended, recites a method for displaying information about a product from an article, comprising:

> in response to receiving a search query for a product, searching an index of articles that describe retail products;
>
> determining, based on the index searching, that a first article is responsive to the search query, the first article including price information for the product and one or more images of the product;
>
> selecting a price for the product from the first article;
>
> selecting an image for the product from the first article based on the price; and
>
> displaying the price and the image for the product.

Applicants maintain that the applied references fail to show at least the limitation:

selecting an image for the product from the first article based on the price.

The Examiner relied on the Bailey reference as disclosing some of the limitations of the canceled claims. Bailey discusses a system and method for locating web pages from which user specified products can be purchased. (Bailey, Abstract). However, Bailey does not describe selecting an image for a product based on the price. Indeed, Bailey does not even use the term "image" anywhere in its patent.

The Examiner also relied on Venkatraman as disclosing the limitations of the claims. Venkatraman discusses searching "for nodes of a stored data structure that satisfy a received search result." (Venkatraman, Abstract). However, Venkatraman fails to disclose "selecting an image for a product from a first article based on the price."

Figures 1C and 1D of Venkatraman do not show selecting an image for a product based on the price. Rather, Figures 1C and 1D are merely illustrations of typical web browsing. Venkatraman does not show any method of selecting an image for a product based on the price. The fact that a number or an image is <u>displayed</u> on a web page does not describe how a system <u>selects</u> an image for a product based on the price.

In addition, on page 24, lines 21-34, Venkatraman mentions a relationship between a "product category (or subcategory) 'pants' and a node associated with the product category (or subcategory) 'belts.'" However, this passage only discusses a relationship between nodes in the stored data structure: "A node 50 in a data structure according to the present invention may also have one or more relationships 59 with one or more different nodes in a data structure", wherein the "nodes" represent a "category" or "sub-category of products offered for sale at one ore more Web sites." (Venkatraman, page 24, lines 21-28). Thus, Venkatraman discusses a relationship between nodes (i.e. categories of products) in the stored data structure, not selecting an image for a product based on the price.

In addition, the Examiner relied on page 37, lines 4-12 of Venkatraman because the reference uses the word "image" in discussing the information shown in the search results. Venkatraman does not provide any indication, however, about how that image is selected. Moreover, the reference provides no disclosure of <u>selecting</u> an image for a product <u>based on</u> a price for the product. In fact, disclosure of this element is absent in all of the applied references.

Williams does not remedy the deficiencies of Bailey or Venkatraman. Williams discusses apparatus, systems and methods for managing online, multi-parcel, multi-carrier, multi-service parcel returns shipping. (Williams, Abstract). The Examiner referred to paragraph 211 of Williams as disclosing "font face" in the rejection of claim 105. While the words "font face" appear in paragraph 211 in the context of allowing a merchant or user to define the font face in a web configuration screen, there is no disclosure of "selecting an image for a product from a first article based on the price." As such, Applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Independent claims 120 and 121 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 97. Claims 98-99, 103-109, 112-113, 115-119 and 122-128 depend directly or indirectly from claim 97. These dependent claims contain the limitations of the claims from which they depend and are patentable for at least the same reasons.

For example, claims 123-127 discuss methods for ranking the prices and the images selected for the product, and selection of the best price and best potential image. No such ranking or selection of best price and best image is discussed within the applied references.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowable over the art of record and request that the Examiner allow this application. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
MARK PEARSON ET AL.

Date: November 19, 2007   By: /Brenda M. Simon/

                                          Brenda M. Simon, Attorney of Record
                                          Registration No. 48,449
                                          FENWICK & WEST LLP
                                          801 California Street
                                          Mountain View, CA 94041
                                          Phone: (650) 335-7198
                                          Fax: (650) 938-5200
                                          E-Mail: bsimon@fenwick.com